

REMARKS

The Office Action has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claims 1, 7, and 12 are amended. No claims are cancelled or added. Thus, claims 1-13 remain pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

Rejections based on Walker

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,092,838 ("Walker"). The rejection should be withdrawn because Walker fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites "a load sensor supported by a sensor plate and a sensor support and in communication with the resilient member and positioned to receive the weight of the seat, wherein the sensor support is formed on an underside of the sensor plate." Walker does not teach or suggest this feature. In particular, Walker discloses a system for detecting the weight of a person using two load beams 14 and 16 mounted on two cross-members 18 and 20 using four pins 50a-d. Two posts 68a-68d are attached to each load beam 14, 16 in which the posts are fed through the holes 88a-d in the cross-members 18 and 20 and are attached to the seat pan 64. When a person sits on the seat 12, the four posts 68a-d are pushed downward to produce bending moments, which are quantified using strain gauges 104a-d. However, Walker does not teach a sensor plate or that the sensor support is formed on the underside of the sensor plate because the strain gauges 104a-d are merely mounted on the load beams 14 and 16 at the intermediate section 30 (see the embodiment of FIGS. 1-2) and the sensors 174a and 174b are merely mounted on the load sensor beam 160 at the intermediate section 168 (see the embodiment of FIGS. 3-4). Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Walker.

Claim 7 (as amended) recites "a pin bracket in communication with the arm via a bracket pin and further adapted to be in communication with the seat, wherein the bracket pin is partially located between the two side plates of the base." Walker does not teach or suggest this feature because the bushing rod 102b (which the Office Action considers to be the bracket pin) is not partially located between the sides of the pin 50a (which the Office Action calls the base). Thus, claim 7 is not anticipated by Walker.

Dependent claims 2-6 and 8-11 depend from claim 1 or claim 7, and are allowable therewith for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable limitations contained therein.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on Walker is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on Cooper

Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,448,512 ("Cooper"). The rejection should be withdrawn because Cooper fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed invention.

For example, claim 7 (as amended) requires "a base having two side plates; an arm rotatably supported by and interdisposed between the side plates of the base via a base pin; [and] a pin bracket in communication with the arm via a bracket pin and further adapted to be in communication with the seat, wherein the bracket pin is partially located between the two side plates of the base." Cooper does not teach or suggest this combination of features for at least the reasons provided below.

First, the Office action states that the support mount 60 of Cooper is considered to be the base having two side plates. (Paragraph 15 of the Office Action.) It is respectfully submitted that the support mount 60 of Cooper does not meet the requirements of the base of claim 7 because Cooper does not teach the particular shape of the support mount 60 but merely shows a rectangular shape; and one with ordinary skill in the art cannot necessarily conclude that the support mount 60 has two side plates from the depiction of the support mount 60 shown in FIG. 2 of Cooper. Second, the lever 70 cannot be considered the arm of claim 7, as asserted in paragraph 15 of the Office Action, because the arm of claim 7 requires that the arm be interdisposed between the side plates of the base. In contrast, Fig. 2 of Cooper clearly shows that the lever 70 attaches to the outside of the support mount 60 (which the Office Action calls the base), as evidenced by the dashed line segment for a portion of the outline for the support mount 60, which means the support mount 60 is placed behind the lever 70. Therefore, the lever 70 cannot be considered to be interdisposed between two side plates of the base, and thus cannot be considered to be the arm of claim 7. Thirdly, the Office Action considers the circular opening 79 of Cooper to be the pin bracket of claim 7.

(Paragraph 15 of the Office Action.) It is respectfully submitted that one with ordinary skill in the art would never consider an opening (i.e., a hole) to be a pin bracket. Therefore, the circular opening 79 of Cooper cannot be considered to be the pin bracket of claim 7. Finally, the support pin 46 (which the Office Action considered to be the bracket pin) is not partially located between two side plates of the base. Indeed, the support pin 46 is not partially located between two side plates of any component. Therefore, the support pin 46 of Cooper cannot be considered to be the bracket pin of claim 7.

Because Cooper does not teach the base, the arm, the pin bracket, and the bracket pin of claim 7, claim 7 is not anticipated by Cooper.

Dependent claim 12 depends from claim 7, and is allowable therewith for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to the further patentable limitations contained therein.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on Cooper is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on Cooper and Aoki

Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of U.S. Patent 6,323,444 ("Aoki"). Claim 13 depends from and contains all the features of claim 7. As previously mentioned, Cooper does not teach the base, the arm, the pin bracket, and the bracket pin of claim 7. Aoki does not cure these deficiencies. Thus, claims 7 and 13 are not rendered unpatentable over Cooper and Aoki. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on Cooper is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to

charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741 .

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3/3/2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5490
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Matthew Kremer

Howard N. Shipley
Registration No. 39,370

Matthew J. Kremer
Registration No. 58,671